

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 803

CG 009 866

AUTHOR Scharf, Peter
TITLE The Just School: A Developmental Context for Social Education.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (55th, Sacramento, California, April 1975)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Correctional Education; *Educational Objectives; *Environmental Influences; Females; Group Dynamics; *Humanization; Program Descriptions; School Role; Socialization; *Social Psychology; Speeches

ABSTRACT

The paper explores two efforts to create a Just Community School using Kohlberg's theory of moral judgment as a guide towards definition of educational aims. The paper notes that developmental theory may lead to two rather different legitimate implementation models and notes some interim observations from the two schools. One of the models implemented emphasizes coordinated natural social and humanistic course which encourages students to interact and cope with external realities. The second model adopts the developmentalism implied in Kohlberg's theory wherein development is the only legitimate aim of education, suggesting that the end product of education should be the growth of the child's "natural, intellectual, and moral capacities." (Author/CJ)

ED103803

THE JUST SCHOOL: A DEVELOPMENTAL CONTEXT
FOR SOCIAL EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TO BE PRESENTED TO THE WESTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
SYMPOSIUM ON MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Peter Scharf

Assistant Professor of Social Ecology

University of California at Irvine 92664

CG-009 866

2/3

THE JUST SCHOOL: A developmental context
for social education

INTRODUCTION

American schools have been characteristically described as having two primary functions. First, they seek to transmit the intellectual tools to survive in a complex, changing society. Second, they are mandated with the task of socializing youth into the contractual obligations implied by a democratic-constitutional society.

Where schools have (at least with middle class youth) been reasonably successful in the first task, they have failed miserably in the second. A number of independent observers (Torney, 1970; Simpson, 1971; Lane, 1967; Adelson, 1971) have noted that the average American citizen has little understanding of the political philosophy underlying democratic society. This failure to understand, accept and pursue the aims of political democracy may be related to the mass alienation and cynicism visible in all aspects of contemporary society.

In order for schools to intervene meaningfully upon the socio-moral thinking of students, they require an educational ideology which at once provides a coherent theory of learning as well as defines objectives consistent with the moral tenets of political democracy. Unfortunately, most educators have accepted either a reward or norm socialization view of socio-moral socialization. The reward theory (Aronfreed, 1961) holds that persons accept particular legal norms because they are rewarded (or model people who are rewarded) for verbally espousing or obeying particular norms. The norm socialization view (Merton, 1956) holds that individuals

are doctrinized to particular legal norms through their participation in societal referent groups with particular normative frameworks.

Where these views may explain why specific norms are espoused by particular groups, they fail to provide any insights into the logical structure underlying an individual's overall conception of society and its laws. To deal with this issue we have adapted the cognitive-developmental (interactionist) approach to learning (Dewey, 1930; G.H. Mead, 1934; Piaget, 1960 etc.) to better understand the problem of moral and legal socialization.

This position holds that conceptions of society and law develop through a progression of invariant stages. Each stage conception of law and society is progressively more differentiated and integrated than is the antecedent stage. These stages of law and society are implied in Lawrence Kohlberg's general theory of moral growth and development (Kohlberg, 1967). This theory, documented by 20 years of cross-cultural and longitudinal research, offers that there are six stages of moral development. Each moral stage contains a particular aspect orienting to the relationship of law to individual and society: At each stage there is a qualitatively discrete mode of legal reasoning. The empirical connection between Kohlberg's stages and structures of law is confirmed in a recent study of legal socialization (Tapp and Kohlberg, 1971) statistically correlating moral and legal reasoning.

At stage one there is an orientation towards punishment and obedience. Law is conceived as the force of the powerful and the weaker submit. At stage two, right action becomes that which satisfies one's own needs. Law is conceived of in terms of the rules of expedience or a naive rational

hedonism ("in America, the law says everyone can get what he wants"). Stage three offers what we call the good boy/girl orientation. Law becomes associated with collective opinion. One obeys the law because that is what others expect. At stage four there is a shift towards fixed definitions of law and social duty. The law is justified in terms of its order maintaining function. "Without law, the entire fabric of society would crumble." Stage five is a legalistic-contract orientation. Law becomes the agreed upon contract among social equals with duties of state and individual clearly defined and regulated. At stage six Kohlberg argues there is a rational, universally valid basis for ethical decision-making. Here the law becomes a repository for social justice principles and is clearly subordinate where the concrete law violates rational ethical principles. (See moral stage descriptions Appendix I.)

Certain environmental conditions are associated with rapid and complete moral development. One condition involves the experience of moral conflict in such a manner that there is group support for resolution of such conflict and tension. A second postulate offers that moral change is associated with active role taking and participation in the political and justice process of the setting. Finally we have found that moral change occurs where individuals accept the social setting's atmosphere as being legitimate and positive as understood at the person's stage of moral maturity. Based on these initial conceptions of moral change, several pilot studies to stimulate moral thinking in classroom settings were initiated. Each postulated a primary objective of offering students educational experiences likely to lead to more mature moral thinking.

CLASSROOM MORAL EDUCATION EXPERIMENTS

Blatt (1973) demonstrated that systematic "Socratic" moral discussions had significant effects upon student moral reasoning when compared with controls. The students in his study increased an average of one/third of a moral stage and retained this advanced thought when compared with the controls over a two year period. Blatt's methodology was shown to be effective in an intervention with a class of college youth (Boyd, 1975), with prisoners in a youth reformatory (Hickey, 1971), and with Junior High School students (Colby, 1972).

Mosher and Springthal (1972) have suggested that peer counseling and cross-age teaching may provide as powerful a developmental impetus as does the Blatt "Socratic" approach. They argue that the taking of the social perspective of another adolescent (as in peer counseling) or that of a young child (cross-age teaching) may provide the means to move towards a more mature moral perspective. Erickson (1974), similarly, has shown that intensive use of fiction and role-playing exercises may also induce moral change.

Where these pilot projects have given great initial encouragement to moral educators, many observers have felt (Rest, 1974; Scharf, 1973; Kohlberg, 1974) that ultimately the scope of moral education interventions must be expanded to include the moral atmosphere of the educational setting involved. Where classroom efforts might effect some moral change in students, it was felt that such change was limited by what has been described as the authoritarian, bureaucratic and oppressive climate of the American High School. It was felt that only if the school were moved towards greater fairness and openness could any meaningful impact upon moral thought be achieved.

THE JUST COMMUNITY APPROACH TO PRISONS (NIANTIC PROJECT)

Our first efforts in this direction were initiated in a correctional rather than an educational institution. The reasons why the first Just Community project was implemented in a prison are several. First, prisons are paradoxically more open to change than are schools (possibly more desperate). Secondly, we felt that an initial project had a greater chance for success in a total institution, where there is the possibility of a controlled input. Finally, the line personnel in the Niantic State Prison seemed more open to change than were the more bureaucratically entrenched teachers we had encountered in the schools.

The project was undertaken in a single cottage at the Niantic State Prison for Women in Connecticut. There had been a near riot at the institution and feelings between staff and inmates were generally hostile. In spite of these antagonisms, inmates, staff and administrators all expressed a willingness to at least explore the possibility of working together to create a new rules structure for the institution.

After a number of months of conflict, there evolved a definition of a program and common rules which were acceptable to most of the staff and inmates. The inmates would control discipline within the cottage through community meetings, and would receive many privileges which had not existed previously on the farm. Inmates agreed to make some accommodation with staff and also agreed to try to settle grievances and conflicts through the proposed democratic structure.

Community meetings were established as the central political forum of the cottage. The entire group would decide joint disciplinary action to be taken against particular members (either inmates or staff). It

would also determine important policy issues for the cottage. Common topics included the resolution of conflicts between inmates, dealing with violations of institutional or cottage rules, and attempts to influence prison policies and restrictions. In each type of action, the critical element involved giving inmates actual control over the particular decision to be made. In no case, even one dealing with a serious incident such as contraband or assault, was the community meeting decision overruled by the prison administration.

The therapy offered in the program was what might be called "political therapy." Through making group decisions, inmates came to take the authority perspective of a single social institution - something many of them had not done in any real sense before. It was hoped that this role-taking of one community would extend to a more general capacity to take the perspective of society at large. Through participating in the prison democracy we hoped prisoners would reevaluate their obligations to others and to society at large.

Research results from the project indicated broad acceptance of the prison democracy. A measure developed to scale acceptance of justice in prison environments indicated positive inmate perceptions of the rules structure of the experimental prison when compared with perceptions of similar inmates in punitive custody, behavior modification and psycho-therapeutic comparison prisons. Inmates in the project changed an average of 39/100ths of a moral stage. This was more than twice the change induced in a prison project using Socratic moral discussions alone in an unchanged prison moral atmosphere.

	<u>Pre-Test</u>	<u>Post-Test</u>	<u>Change</u>
Model Cottage Inmates (under 24 years of age) (n - 17)	259	299	39
Control Women's Prison (n - 10)	270	268	-2
Control Men's Prison (n - 18)	254	256	2
Control using Moral Discussion Groups without Democratic Moral Atmosphere (Males) (n - 19)	251	268	17

(Scores are represented in terms of Mean Moral Maturity Scores - Stage One = 100 MMMS points, i.e., Stage Two = 200)

TWO JUST SCHOOLS: The SELF School (Irvine, California) and the Cluster School (Cambridge, Massachusetts)

In 1974 two related but independent efforts were undertaken to create just community school projects. One project was initiated by the staff of the Irvine Unified School District and the Program in Social Ecology of the University of California at Irvine. A second project was initiated by the staff of the Cambridge Public Schools and the Moral Education Center at Harvard University, directed by Lawrence Kohlberg.

The Irvine project evolved from an educational discontent following a "drug-bust" in the town of Irvine (California). 135 adolescents were arrested on drug charges stemming from investigations by three narcotics agents "planted" in the local high school. Educational officials and parents were, needless to say, shocked by the arrests and began a process of self-examination about the intentions of education in the school district. The Superintendent and advisors conceived of a new alternative high school which would deal with affective and social education components of education as a central education objective.

Consultants from major universities were solicited for inputs and a "manager" was selected and given broad responsibility to conceptualize

the school. During the summer of 1974, seven teachers were hired and over 200 students recruited. A large warehouse was chosen to house the school. The summer months were marked by intensive community dialogue in which parents and students became actively involved in the creation of the school.

The model which has evolved at SELF involves intensive interdisciplinary coursework as the basic educational unit. Students in one subprogram called "Man and His Environment" are involved in an intensive investigation of all aspects of man's biological and social environment. Another, less academically-oriented course called, "Eat Right, Think Right, Feel Better," involves students in reflecting upon the biological and spiritual aspects of their daily diet. Students run a student farm in which they grow their own vegetables. Many courses have an active community education component in which students spend large amounts of time in the field. This includes, for example, a very exciting outdoor education rock climbing course, a well-conceived work experience program, and a tutoring-psychology program for autistic kids.

The democratic component of the school involves a complex representative system of governance. Students are elected to the "Rep Council" from villages (interpersonally oriented small groups which meet each morning) and from the school at large. Students on the "Rep Council" have ultimate disciplinary authority and can vote, for example, to expel or otherwise discipline any student. In one meeting the "Rep Council" voted to expel one girl for smoking marijuana in the school parking lot and was over-ridden by the "Community Meeting" which has the power to overrule the "Rep Council." This incident was SELF's version of the

"Marlborough vs. Madison" case forcing the school to make explicit its system of checks, balances and judicial review.

In 1969 a small group of Harvard students organized the Cambridge Pilot School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Funded by a Kennedy Foundation grant, the Harvard group convinced the Cambridge School Department to join the effort and set aside space for it in Rindge Technical School, one of the two adjoining public high schools in Cambridge. Implicit in the genesis of the Pilot School was the desire, as in most alternatives, to create a small, informal, culturally diverse school that would "contrast with the irrelevance and impersonality of the public school system." The Pilot School proved successful in helping students realize personal goals in terms of higher education and career selection.

During the Spring of 1974 the School became oversubscribed. Fifty-five students were on the waiting list. One of the parents of a student on the list, an active member of the Cambridge community, polled the other waiting families and determined that there was a great enough desire on their part to create another alternative high school. A favorable response was also forthcoming from the Superintendent of Schools, the Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Schools, the two Headmasters, and several School Committee members.

A series of well-attended meetings culminated on July 2, 1974 with a proposal to the School Committee. It recommended the "establishment of a second alternative program within the Cambridge High School complex, not modeled after the Pilot School, but retaining and building on positive aspects of the Pilot School experience while at the same time serving as a possible cluster prototype within the context of the proposed Career Education plan of organization for the Cambridge Secondary Schools" (proposal for Cluster School, 1974).

A "workshop" group ended the Summer of 1974 with guidelines that spelled out the enrollment, staffing, curriculum, governance, and space needs of the program. The group had also committed itself to implement Kohlberg's concept of the Just Community or Moral Development approach to the Cluster School. Professor Kohlberg agreed to serve as a consultant to the project.

The structure of the school revolves around Community Meetings held weekly in which the community as a whole discusses issues of concern to the group. In addition, "advisor groups" held at least once a week deal with students' personal concerns. A discipline committee consists of six students and one teacher (appointed on a rotating basis) whenever community rules are violated. In all, 60 students from the School at large attend the school.

The courses offered by the seven teachers and Harvard Graduate School of Education doctoral students are mostly in the social sciences and English. The School is physically with the larger Rindge School building and students take classes in the regular High School program. The teachers in the school are assigned to the project and have other duties in addition to their participation in the Cluster School program.

Wasserman (1975) indicates that the emphasis of the school is more on community democracy than upon the course curriculum. She offers that "most schools do little to help build community feeling or responsibility." The feelings are one of the more pressing reasons for the formation of alternative schools. She feels there has been dramatic change in student feelings and responsibility towards the school. In the early meetings, students acted "more in terms of the individuals own interest . . . than

in terms of the welfare of the school." In recent months there has been an "increased demonstration of responsibility to other people and the consideration of group welfare."

Both school projects offer a major departure from existing alternative school programs. Where most alternative schools seem to focus on an ideology of individual choice and affective growth, both projects offer an ideology of democratic decision-making which seeks to resolve conflicts as justice issues between the individual and group. In addition, where most alternative schools emphasize individual learning contracts and free choice of attendance, both schools have dealt with both curriculum and attendance issues as conflicts between the rights of the individual and the claims of the school as a whole. Finally each school has adopted a cognitive learning model emphasizing cognitive conflict rather than a social learning (Bandura, 1970) or humanistic approach (Neil, 1960).

To illustrate these differences, let me offer some characteristic responses to moral atmosphere interviews dealing with student perceptions of school rules. One student in a "laissez faire" alternative school in California offered:

"In here they want you to do what you want. In the regular high school, they made you go to class . . . in here they don't. There you have to study what the teacher wants. Here you only do what you want. You come when you feel motivated . . . and if you don't like it you can split. You earn credits for what you like . . . I'm earning some for surfing . . . "

A SELF student saw his school's contract quite differently:

"In here it's democratic. You decide the goals of the school as a group. If someone breaks a rule he goes to a Rep Council Discipline Board we elected. We decided the rules with the staff. You try to do what's best for the school and you . . . "

In spite of these broad commonalities between SELF and the Cluster School there have evolved marked differences between the two programs. These differences reflect population differences and administrative relationships as well as some clear divergences in applied educational ideology.

The Irvine students compose a strange bi-modal mix. Roughly 20% are classified as Mentally Gifted Minors with I.Q.'s of over 132. Nearly 40% are considered students "at risk." A large proportion of this group are currently on parole. Others are on probation, have been declared truant or have flunked almost all their courses in the traditional High School. The white population and suburban architecture of the Irvine community masks a highly mobile, rootless culture which is apparent upon any contact with the SELF school kids. Many live without parents in Housing Complexes with older siblings, friends or lovers. Many have moved to the area in the past two years. Recreational facilities in the "New Town" atmosphere of Irvine are next to non-existent.

The Cambridge students present a quite different demographic portrait. Where the students are mostly urban, working class adolescents, they generally come from more stable backgrounds than do the Irvine adolescents. Some of the students have had school problems and confrontations with the law, but fewer are on probation or parole compared with the Irvine

group. As well, the Cambridge community can be characterized as poorer, but more stable than is Irvine.

The relationships of the schools with their district administrations differ in some respects. The Irvine project was initiated by the Irvine Unified School District which conceived of the idea in response to the April drug-raid. In contrast, the Cluster School was initiated by a group of discontented parents and teachers who approached the administration with the plan for the school. The Cluster School has experienced more conflict with other teachers and administrators. This is attributed to the fact that the Cluster School is physically located within a larger high school building. Since the SELF school is three miles from the nearest educational facility there has been only sparse dialogue and conflict with other district educators.

Both projects have established relationships with a local university. The Cluster School invited Lawrence Kohlberg and three graduate students to participate as consultants to the project financed from a large grant held by Kohlberg from the Kennedy Foundation. The author was hired by the Irvine district from district funds to coordinate staff training and work with some especially troubled adolescents. In addition over 20 University of California at Irvine Social Ecology students have participated in the project coordinating research, teaching innovative courses, and participating in morning "village" meetings.

Beyond these differences in population and external relationships, quite divergent educational applied philosophies have emerged in the two programs:

One set of differences is related to the course curriculum of each school. The SELF school is moving towards an elaborate interconnecting, interdisciplinary, community oriented course structure. The Cluster School has an existing course structure but has more seriously emphasized intensive community meetings and dilemma discussions.

The question that emerges is the relationship of problem oriented coursework to moral decision-making: Kohlberg has implied that coursework should supplement the democratic process in the school rather than really complement it (Kohlberg, 1972). It seems to be assumed that the dilemmas raised in the context of the school and hypothetical dilemmas are sufficient both to stimulate more mature moral thought and to provide the goals for the student to act upon the world.

It might reasonably be asked if moral questions shouldn't be raised in the context of coursework and problem analysis, rather than primarily in "small group moral discussions" and town meetings? If the student is to be educated to deal with complex social issues with any success, shouldn't the school provide in an active way analytic problem solving strategies to complement those of moral analysis?

To illustrate this question, let us suppose that a future citizen will be expected to become involved in a public debate regardless of Foreign Aid to a starving Indian population in the year 2000. What kinds of tools will he or she need to make a meaningful input to this decision? First, clearly he will require the analytic capacity to understand the economic, ecological, political and social aspects of the problem. He must be able to understand a population curve and understand the relationship of resources to birth rate and death rate. He also

must be able to consider a number of possible solutions to the problem (Malthusian checks, birth control and education, planned migration, etc.). Once he has considered these aspects of the situation he must be able to apply ethical criteria to the dilemma: Is it right to let people starve? Are some lives more valuable than others? Who has responsibility for the plight of the third world? In what sense is life ultimately sacred?

Obviously the problem cannot be approached simply from ethical criteria. Factual definitions, predictions of the consequences of action must be evaluated. This involves biological, social and political analysis, as well as some elements of futuristic planning.

In order for a citizen to be able to solve this or a similar problem, he must be given a broader education than is provided by moral dilemmas and political town meetings. Where these provide meaningful starting places, if done in isolation they imply an inward looking education, rather than one that moves out towards the social ecological dilemmas facing man.

Another issue involves the nature of democracy in each school. The Cambridge project has chosen to implement a direct participatory democracy. The SELF school has opted for a representative model. There are arguments in favor of both strategies. Representative democracy models the larger American political system. In representative democracy there are built-in conflicts (such as what happens if the Rep council and the community meetings disagree) that do not ^{often} emerge from a direct participatory mode. On the other hand, direct democracy forces a greater involvement than does representative democracy. It also is likely that it is easier for

kids below stage four to identify with the immediacy of participatory democracy as opposed to the more abstract (organic solidarity) contact implied in the representational model.

The two schools differ in size. The larger SELF school (250 students) is able to offer a broader variety of courses than is possible in the Cluster School (including such things as Astrophysics, Chemistry, Calculus). It also is viable as an autonomous unit. The smaller Cluster School must exist as a School Within a School and must restrict its course offerings to English and History. Teachers must split time allegiances with other school duties. Students see the school as only one involvement during the day. On the other hand, Community Meetings with three hundred people require the use of a megaphone and even the most exciting meetings failed to keep the attention of all of the students involved. (In this respect it is interesting to speculate how the Athenians of Pericles' day maintained the interest of Polis Meetings of 6000 people and juries of 501). Where these size differences reflect architectural and political constraints there are philosophic views implicit in each school's size. The SELF model opts for a comprehensive program orienting towards community understanding and change. The Cluster School has chosen a strategy for greater intimacy and group solidarity.

These divergences reflect legitimate differences in interpretation of the educational implications of the cognitive-developmental, interactionalist tradition in psychology (esp. Dewey, G.H., Mead and Piaget).

On the most abstract level each school has emphasized somewhat different educational aims. Both definitions seem legitimate to me in terms of the developmental interpretation of growth and learning. Dewey

17

emphasizes in Democracy and Education (1916) a conflict on the level of application between the goal of "Social Efficiency" and the goal of "Natural (maturationalist) Development." He offers that any coherent educational program must integrate the two goals in such a way as to avoid "a subjugation of individual to the state" and also to avoid a philosophy of "romantic individualism." Where neither school has slipped into a cultural transmission (Social Efficiency) or romantic position (Natural Development), each has adopted a somewhat different educational ideology:

The SELF School has defined its goals in terms of the student's better comprehension of the world and his ability to cope with it. This implies more than sheer adaptation to an existing social and biological niche. In order to cope a person must seek to change his niche as well as find a role within it. Where social coping implies the development of more comprehensive cognitive and moral structures, such development may be a subordinate goal to the end of reflective social action.

The Cluster School has adopted the developmentalism implied in Kohlberg's theory. For Kohlberg, development is considered to be the only "legitimate" aim of education (Kohlberg, 1973). This implies that the end product to be sought by the educator is the growth of the child's "natural, intellectual and moral capacities." Of course these capacities are ultimately social in nature, however the goal of social change is seen as a desired by-product of education, rather than as an aim in itself.

In practice these two philosophies result in quite different programs. The SELF school, as noted, has emphasized coordinated natural, social and humanistic coursework attempting to enable students to interact.

and cope with the external realities of his world. This follows from a philosophy of reflective social action. The school representative democracy is seen as a means to get students to cope with the larger political system, rather than as an end in itself. The creation of psychological community within the school is again seen as a prerequisite for meaningful interaction rather than as a specific educational aim.

The Cluster School in contrast has posited aims in terms of the creation of a just school moral climate and individual moral growth. It is argued (really quite cogently) by Kohlberg, Mackin and Wasserman that through the creation of a moral community and through student participation, adolescents will at once identify with the school community and also become more morally mature. Instead of focusing on conflicts in the larger society (as at SELF) the Cluster School orients its curriculum to the conflicts emerging within the school (eg. "Does the school have the right to curb dope smoking" in school"). The end product is not really seen as the creation of a permanent political community, but rather is defined as the moral growth achieved through the student's political participation.

Involved in these issues is the core conception of the Just School. Is it a means for the student to become involved in his political world, or is it an intentionally created democratically erected school seeking to stimulate growth in the individual. Stewart (1974) seems to argue along with Kohlberg that the goal should be to create a microcosm of democratic life within the school. Dewey (1906, 1916), I am convinced, saw the internal democratic structure of school as primarily a means for the individual to become involved in the larger community. Where he

admires contemporary attempts at school democracy (eg. the Gary Plan), the primary thrust is towards the creation of a school curriculum in which the students learn to cope with the larger political community.

The democratic school is seen as one vehicle towards such social coping.

The issues between the approaches seem to me difficult and in part empirical issues:

The SELF school might argue that its approach forces the student out of his adolescent egocentrism and forces an involvement in the world without. It would offer that moral conflicts ultimately involve socio-political issues outside the school and should be dealt with as such. Also, it could suggest that its diverse approach offers skills to allow students the opportunity to interact with the world in such a way that further development is more likely after high school. Finally, it would note that by offering students such activities as rock climbing, moral dilemmas will arise in a more compelling context (providing teachers are adequately trained) than would be possible in the somewhat contrived community discipline meeting.

The Cluster School has some powerful arguments for its approach. Nancy Richardson (a Research Associate of the Harvard project) has argued that since most of the students in both SELF and the Cluster School are a mix between stages two and three, a program focusing on external social realities probably is beyond most of the students' "moral grasp." Kohlberg has similarly argued that one reason for the New Social Studies' (Oliver, 1956; Fenton, 1960) apparent failure involves their ignoring the development capacities of its student clients (Kohlberg, 1972). He might also argue that meaningful moral conflicts for stage two and three students must begin with the more psychologically comprehensible

conflicts of group life rather than the more abstract dilemmas of the larger community. Also he might suggest that the "organic political solidarity" of the SELF school is too removed, too abstract for most students to comprehend.

To resolve these issues I see two critical strategies. First, each school must take upon itself the task of a comprehensive formative evaluation. The SELF school has begun a research program and the Cluster school is now beginning a similar effort. The goals of such a research program should be the resolution of some of the basic issues involved in the Just School project, not simply a justification of its own approach. Critical to each program's success are such questions as:

How do students of different moral stages perceive the two internal democratic systems (i.e., representative and primary democratic systems)?

Which school seems to have a greater impact upon moral thinking?

Which school seems to have greater impact upon intellectual skills?

In which setting is there greater application of intellectual and moral capacities to problems outside of school?

In which setting is there genuine impact upon life choices made by students following graduation?

Secondly, I hope both schools will seek to integrate the strengths of the other. The SELF school badly needs an intermediate political group between the small group (Village) and the larger "Rep Council." The Cluster School is moving towards a more differentiated political structure including appeals and review processes. In terms of coursework,

SELF needs to expand and integrate its beginning interdisciplinary approach. The Cluster school has moved to create a more integrated course structure. The SELF school probably needs to focus more on the goal of psychological community. The Cluster school might seek to expand its offerings to those of the natural sciences.

Both schools, I feel, offer a hopeful new direction for education. They seek to deal with the problem of political socialization in a manner that uses an empirically grounded psychology and posits ethical goals consistent with those of political democracy. The approach clearly is an advance beyond earlier experiments using moral discussions in an unchanged school environment. In consciously creating a school constitution and implementing it, the student has a chance to create a model political society. Whereas I have noted the Just School idea can move in two radically different directions (towards reflective social action or towards internal democracy), I believe the concept provides clearly the most promising alternative to the dilemmas facing American education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelson, J. Political Imagination of Young Adolescent in Coles (Ed.) 12-16: Early Adolescence. New York: Morton, 1972.

Aronfreed, J. The Nature, Variety and Social Patterns of Moral to Transgression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 63: 223-240 (1961).

Bandura, A. & Huston, A. Identification as a process of incidental learning. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 311-319.

Blatt, M. Effects of moral decisions on Adolescent. Moral Judgment in (Kohlberg, Ed.) Recent Research on Moralization, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

Brunner, J. Process of Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Colby, A. Relation to Logical Moral Stage Change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Columbia University.

Dewey, J. How we think. (2nd ed.) Boston: D. C. Health, 1933.

Dewey, J. Democracy and Education, New York: Free Press, 1961.

Dewey, J. Experience and Education, New York: Collier, 1963 (written in 1938).

Dewey, J. Schools of Tomorrow, Boston: D. C. Health, 1906.

Erickson, L. "Psychological Growth for Women" in Counseling and Values Vol. 18, 2, 1974.

Erikson, E. Childhood and society. New York: Norton, 1950.

Fenton, E. Teaching the New Social Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966.

Hickey, J. "Effects of Moral Discussions with Delinquent Youth," in Recent Research on Moralization, IBID.

Kohlberg, L., Turiel, E., "Moral Development and Moral Education" in Psychology and the Education Process, (G. Lesser, Ed.) 1971.

Kohlberg, L. "Development as the Aim of Education" in Harvard Educational Review, 1972.

Kohlberg, L., The Child as a Moral Philosopher, Psychology Today, Vol. 1, 1968.

Knutson, L. Human Basis of the Politics. Chicago: Aldine, 1972.

Lane, R. Political Ideology. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Maslow, A. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature, 1971.

Neil, A.S. Summerhill, New York: Hart, 1961.

Mead, L. H. Mind, Self, Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Merton, R. Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956.

Mosher, R., Springhall, N. "Psychological Education" in Counseling Psychologist, 1972.

Piaget, J. The general problem of the psychobiological development of the child. In J. M. Tanner & B. Inhelder (Eds.) Discussion on child development. Vol. 4, New York: International Universities Press, 1960.

Piaget, J. Cognitive development in children. In R. Ripple & V. Rockcastle (Eds.) Piaget rediscovered: A report on cognitive studies in curriculum development. Ithaca: Cornell University School of Education, 1966.

Selman, R. First things. Pleasantville, New York: Guidance Associates, 1972.

Scharf, P. Moral Atmosphere in the Prison. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Xerox University, Microfilms, 34, 332, 1974.

Simpson, E. Democracy's Stepchildren. San Francisco: Jossey Press, 1972.

Stewart, J. Towards a Theory for Values. Development Education - Unpublished dissertation. Michigan State University, 1974.

Tapp, J., & Kohlberg, L. Developing senses of Law and Legal Justice, Journal of Social Issues, 1971.

Wasserman, E. Proposal to Create a Just School. Boston University Graduate School of Education (unpublished).